

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

PPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/721,135	11/25/2003	Robert Kronenberger	00130P0146US	6333	
32116	7590 07/14/2005		EXAMINER		
WOOD, PHILLIPS, KATZ, CLARK & MORTIMER			SUTTON, AI	SUTTON, ANDREW W	
500 W. MADISON STREET SUITE 3800 CHICAGO, IL 60661			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3765		

DATE MAILED: 07/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

T	Wh

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/721,135	KRONENBERGER, ROBERT				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Andrew W. Sutton	3765				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 N	lovember 2003.					
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This	s action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on 25 November 2003 is/a Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 2003.	are: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ object drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See tion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:					

Application/Control Number: 10/721,135

Art Unit: 3765

1

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kronenberger (US 6,370,696). Kronenberger illustrates (Fig. 1) a hat comprising a crown having an exposed external surface extending in a inverted cup shape having a front, a rear, a right side, and a left side, the crown futher comprising a surface for embracing the wearers head, the crown can be divided into a front/right side octant, a right side/front octant, a right side/rear octant, a rear/right side octant, a front /left side octant, a left side/front octant, a left side/rear octant, and a rear/left side octant. Kronenberger illustrates (Fig. 1) a brim projecting from the visor. Kronenberger illustrates (Fig. 5) the crown having a top opening from which the head projects. Kronenberger illustrates throughout the figures that logos and information can be placed on the hat. It would have been obvious to place logs/information on the cap as it provides no structural limitations to the cap. *In re Seid*, 161 F.2d 229. 73 USPQ 431 (CCPA 1947) deals with a advertising display device comprising a bottle and a hollow member in the shape of a human figure from the waist up which was adapted to fit over and cover the neck of the bottle, wherein the hollow member and the bottle together give the impression of the human body. Appellant argued that certain limitations in the

Application/Control Number: 10/721,135

Art Unit: 3765

upper part of the body, including the arrangement of the arms were not taught in the prior art. The court found that matters relating to ornamentation only, which have no mechanical function, cannot be relied upon to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Loeffelholz (US 6,175,963), Duncan (US 5,556,135), Mostert (US 5,452,479), Zumbiel (US 5,410,760), and Ahn (US 6,789,267) show the state of the art.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew W. Sutton whose telephone number is (571) 272-6093. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 7:30-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John J. Calvert can be reached on (571) 272-4983. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JUANSI. CALVERT SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700 Page 3

ï